



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/553,213

12/16/2005

Satoshi Aoyama

125602

8979

25944 7590 09/22/2011

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

SIDDIQUEE, MUHAMMAD S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1726

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/22/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com

jarmstrong@oliff.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/553,213	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AOYAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MUHAMMAD SIDDIQUEE	<b>Art Unit</b> 1726	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's amendment filed on 8/17/2011 was received. Claims 1-2 are amended and claims 5, 11 are cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12 are pending in this application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Isom does not teach supporting a catalyst in the reformer. The examiner asserts that Isom teaches that the reformer can be a an ATR or a catalytic steam reformer [Abstract; Fig. 2; paragraph 0011, 0014, 0025]. Therefore, a catalyst is inherently supported in the reformer.
2. Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 8/17/2011, with respect to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-4 and 5-10 has been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1726

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimioki et al (JP 2003-059519) in view of Isom et al (US 2004/0038091 A1).

Regarding claims 1-4 and 6-7, Kimioki discloses a fuel cell comprising anode, cathode, stabilized zirconia (YSZ) electrolyte and nickel/stabilized zirconia (Ni/YSZ) hydrogen permeable metal layer. Kimioki teaches a starting combustion part (7) (reformer or fuel gas supply module) that supplies a fuel gas containing hydrogen and methane (hydrocarbon compound) to the anode. Kimioki also teaches an oxidizing gas supply module that supplies an oxidizing gas to the cathode. Kimioki further teaches internal reforming section within the fuel electrode where steam reforming of methane in the fuel gas is carried out which is an endothermic reaction. Kimioki also teaches a control section which controls the various sections/operations of the fuel cell system

Art Unit: 1726

[Fig. 1; paragraph 0020, 0030, 0031, 0041]. Kimioki does not teach a steam reforming reformer, however, various kinds of reformers are used to generate fuel gas for the fuel cells. Isom discloses a fuel cell system comprising a fuel processing system (14) (including a reformer (32, 132) and shift converter (34)) which converts fuel feed stock, steam and air into hydrogen and carbon dioxide; a control system which controls the reformer based on the internal temperature of the reformer [Abstract; Fig. 1; paragraph 0011, 0014, 0021, 0024-0025]. Though Isom specifically did not disclose any oxygen supply unit, it is inherent that an oxygen supply unit must be present in the system as evidence from (US 2004/0053088 A). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a reformer and a control system as taught by Isom in order to achieve efficient operation of the fuel cell.

Regarding claim 8, the reaction in the reformer is a heat involved reaction because of the partial oxidation of fuel with oxygen and steam reforming reaction [paragraph 0021].

7. Claims 9-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimioki et al (JP 2003-059519 ) in view of Isom et al (US 2004/0038091 A1) as applied in claim 1 and further in view of Ito et al (US 2003/0061937 A1).

Regarding claims 9-10, Kimioki/Isom remains silent about the detail of the hydrogen permeable membrane. However, Ito discloses a fuel cell system comprising a hydrogen permeable membrane. The hydrogen-permeable membrane includes a metal base layer (electrolyte layer) containing a Group VA element (inorganic material), two

Art Unit: 1726

metal middle layers (hydrogen permeable metal layer) which are formed on both of the two sides of the metal base layer (electrolyte layer) [Abstract; paragraph 0043-0045]. Ito also teaches that water is supplied in the permeable membrane and it retain there [paragraph 0030, 0031, 0034]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a hydrogen permeable membrane as taught by Ito in the fuel cell of Kimioki/Isom in order to extract the hydrogen gas from mixed gases which have been generated in the reforming portion.

Regarding claim 12, Ito teaches an electrolyte membrane comprising a vanadium base layer (43), a proton conductor middle layer (42, 44) on either side of the vanadium base layer (43), and a palladium coat (41, 45) on an opposite side of either proton conductor middle layer from the side of the proton conductor middle layer contacting the vanadium base layer [Fig. 6; paragraph 0048].

### ***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1726

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MUHAMMAD SIDDIQUEE whose telephone number is (571) 270-3719. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30 am to 4:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/553,213

Page 7

Art Unit: 1726

/Muhammad Siddiquee/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/Patrick Joseph Ryan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1726